REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were pending. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Claim 17 has been added. Claims 1, 9 and 17 are independent claims. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claim 5 because of an informality.

Claim 5 has been amended.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. The amendment to claim 1 is supported, for example, at one or more portions of original claim 3, FIG. 3, paragraph 0045 (page 12), paragraph 0048 (pages 13-14), paragraph 0051 (page 15), paragraph 0054 (page 16) and paragraph 0072 (pages 20-21). The amendment to claim 9 is supported, for example, at one or more portions of original claim 11, FIG. 3, paragraph 0045 (page 12), paragraph 0048 (pages 13-14), paragraph 0051 (page 15), paragraph 0054 (page 16) and paragraph 0072 (pages 20-21).

Claim 17 has been added. Added claim 17 is supported, for example, at one or more portions of claims 9 and 11, paragraph 0087 (pages 25-26), FIG. 3, paragraph 0045 (page 12), paragraph 0048 (pages 13-14), paragraph 0051 (page 15), paragraph 0054 (page 16) and paragraph 0072 (pages 20-21).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §101

The Office Action rejects claims 1-16 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-16 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,789,252 (Burke et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,199,195 (Goodwin et al.).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended.

Claim 1 now recites apparatus comprising: a computer to provide a computer-implemented framework for a composite application, the framework comprising: an object access layer to exchange data with enterprise base systems and to present the data to a composite application through a uniform interface; a business object modeling layer comprising a business object modeler to provide a user interface (UI) for constructing a business object; and a service layer to enable services to the composite application, the service layer comprising a collaboration services module to enable collaboration services to the composite application, the business object modeling layer linking at least one of the collaboration services associated with the business object to the business object; wherein the collaboration services module enables at least one generic collaboration service; **wherein the object modeling layer that comprises the business object modeler to provide the user interface (UI) for constructing the business object comprises a module to derive at least one object specific service from the at least one generic collaboration service linked with the business object by the business object modeling layer; and wherein the object modeling layer that comprises the business object modeler to provide the user interface (UI) for constructing the business object is separate from the service layer that comprises the collaboration services module to enable collaboration services to the composite application**. (emphasis added).

Neither Burke et al. nor Goodwin et al. nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest the apparatus of claim 1.

Burke et al. disclose that a business object definition system includes a Session Manager software component, which can call an Enterprise Explorer software component, an Instance Editor software component and a Network Editor software component (col. 24, lines 61-64). The Enterprise Explorer software component allows a user to all definitional content of an object

from one user interface (col. 25, lines 5-8). The user can selectively view the object's revision, composition, attributes, value refinements, classifications, network connections, renderings, or reference information, and can execute the following revision actions against the selected component: Open, Release, Cancel, Freeze and Unfreeze (col. 25, lines 8-13).

Burke et al. further disclose that a Collaborative Design System can be assembled using the business object definition system components (col. 52, lines 50-51). The Collaborative Design System makes specific use of components of the Product Composition System and Managed Negotiation System to handle design proposals and counters (col. 52, lines 55-58). Design content can be revision controlled with instances of ingrediential content optionally given content ownership (col. 52, lines 58-61).

Thus, Burke et al. disclose an Enterprise Explorer software component that allows a user to view all definitional content of an object and that the user can selectively view the object's revision.

Burke et al. also disclose a Collaborative Design System.

However, contrary to the assertion in the Office Action (see Office Action, page 6, line 18-page 7, line 8), Burke et al. do not teach or suggest that the selective viewing of the object's revision, as allowed by the Enterprise Explorer software, is derived from a service from the Collaborative Design System.

Applicants have noted the Collaborative Design System Example in Burke et al., which states that design content can be revision controlled with instances of ingrediential content optionally given content ownership (col. 52, lines 58-61).

However, such statement, by itself, does not indicate that the Collaborative Design System is the module that enables the revision control.

Indeed, the term revision control appears throughout the specification of Burke et al., independently of the Collaborative Design System Example.

For example, a Revision Control section of the specification, independent of the Collaborative Design System Example of Burke et al., states:

> Revision Control
>
> Revision control may be used to formally manage and release the different versions of a definition that evolve over time.

> Revision Control is an optional feature when creating the definition of an object.
>
> Content effectivity is used to track the beginning and ending participation of individual ingrediential objects of the definition in the range of object definition revisions. Content effectivity provides the ability to create revision instances whenever they are needed and then to dispose of them when they are no longer needed knowing that they can be recreated.
>
> Composition Effectivity is used to designate which revision of an ingredient option works for which range of revisions of the object definition. Versioning
>
> Using a date and/or a revision, the exact versions of any or all related ingrediential objects in effect at a moment in time can be determined.

(Burke et al. col. 21, lines 31-50)

Thus, the Revision Control section of the specification of Burke et al. explicitly states that revision control is an optional feature when creating the definition of an object. There is no mention of the Collaborative Design System.

In view of the above, it would appear that there is no teaching or suggestion that the Collaborative Design System is the module that enables revision control.

Consequently, even if the Enterprise Explorer software component teaches a type of object modeling layer that comprises a business object modeler to provide the user interface (UI) for constructing the business object, as appears to be asserted by the Office Action, and even if the view of the object's revision teaches a type of at least one object specific service, as appears to be asserted by the Office Action, and even if the Collaborative Design System teaches a type of collaboration services module and at least one generic collaboration service, as appears to be asserted by the Office Action, Burke et al. do not appear to teach or suggest that **the object modeling layer that comprises the business object modeler to provide the user interface (UI) for constructing the business object comprises a module to derive at least one object specific service from the at least one generic collaboration service linked with the business object by the business object modeling layer**, as recited in claim 1. (emphasis added).

In the event that the Office Action is taking the position that the Enterprise Explorer software component in Burke et al. is part of the Collaborative Design System in Burke et al., Applicants respectfully point out that, in that event, the Enterprise Explorer software component would not be separate from the Collaborative Design System in Burke et al.

Consequently, in that event, even if the Enterprise Explorer software component teaches a type of object modeling layer that comprises a business object modeler to provide the user interface (UI) for constructing the business object, as appears to be asserted by the Office Action, and even if the view of the object's revision teaches a type of at least one object specific service, as appears to be asserted by the Office Action, and even if the Collaborative Design System teaches a type of collaboration services module and at least one generic collaboration service, as appears to be asserted by the Office Action, Burke et al. do not appear to teach or suggest that the **object modeling layer that comprises the business object modeler to provide the user interface (UI) for constructing the business object is separate from the service layer that comprises the collaboration services module to enable collaboration services to the composite application**, as recited in claim 1. (emphasis added).

The Office Action states that:

> Burke discloses **at least one of the collaboration services** but does not explicitly disclose:
>
> **- the business object modeling layer linking at least one of the collaboration services associated with the business object to the business object**.
>
> However, Goodwin discloses:
>
> **- a business object modeling layer linking at least one of services associated with a business object to the business object** (col. 6 lines 48-51, "The unified models 206 together comprise a repository that manages object schema (i.e., the unified models 206) and their links to enterprises resources, such as databases and world wide web sites."). [Examiner's Remarks: Note that enterprise resources, such as databases and world wide web sites, provide services to an business object.]
>
> Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate

> the teaching of Goodwin into the teaching of Burke to include the business object modeling layer linking at least one of the collaboration services associated with the business object to the business object. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to associate a collaboration service with a business object so that the business object can reference the collaboration service directly.

(Office Action, page 5, line 16-page 6, line 10)

However, Applicants respectfully point out that, even if Burke et al. is modified as proposed in the Office Action, the result would not teach or suggest that **the object modeling layer that comprises the business object modeler to provide the user interface (UI) for constructing the business object comprises a module to derive at least one object specific service from the at least one generic collaboration service linked with the business object by the business object modeling layer; and the object modeling layer that comprises the business object modeler to provide the user interface (UI) for constructing the business object is separate from the service layer that comprises the collaboration services module to enable collaboration services to the composite application**, as recited in claim 1. (emphasis added).

For at least the reasons above, neither Burke et al. nor Goodwin et al. nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest apparatus comprising: a computer to provide a computer-implemented framework for a composite application, the framework comprising: an object access layer to exchange data with enterprise base systems and to present the data to a composite application through a uniform interface; a business object modeling layer comprising a business object modeler to provide a user interface (UI) for constructing a business object; and a service layer to enable services to the composite application, the service layer comprising a collaboration services module to enable collaboration services to the composite application, the business object modeling layer linking at least one of the collaboration services associated with the business object to the business object; wherein the collaboration services module enables at least one generic collaboration service; **wherein the**

object modeling layer that comprises the business object modeler to provide the user interface (UI) for constructing the business object comprises a module to derive at least one object specific service from the at least one generic collaboration service linked with the business object by the business object modeling layer; and wherein the object modeling layer that comprises the business object modeler to provide the user interface (UI) for constructing the business object is separate from the service layer that comprises the collaboration services module to enable collaboration services to the composite application, as recited in claim 1. (emphasis added).

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 9

Claim 9 has been amended.

Claim 9 now recites a computer-implemented method of implementing a composite application in a framework, the method comprising: accessing, by a computer, an object to exchange data with enterprise base systems and to present the data to a composite application through a uniform interface; modeling, by a computer, a business object to enable a user interface (UI) for constructing a business object; enabling, by a computer, services to the composite application including providing collaboration services to the composite application, the modeling comprises directly linking at least one of the collaboration services associated with the business object to the business object; wherein **the providing the collaboration services comprises enabling at least one generic collaboration service; wherein the modeling comprises: deriving at least one object specific service from the at least one generic collaboration service; and providing an object modeling layer that comprises a business object modeler to provide the UI for constructing a business object; and wherein the enabling services comprises: providing a service layer that is to enable the services and is separate from the object modeling layer**. (emphasis added).

Neither Burke et al. nor Goodwin et al. nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest the method of claim 9.

As stated above, Burke et al. disclose an Enterprise Explorer software component that allows a user to view all definitional content of an object and that the user can selectively view the object's revision.

Burke et al. also disclose a Collaborative Design System.

However, contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, Burke et al. do not teach or suggest that the selective viewing of the object's revision, as allowed by the Enterprise Explorer software, is derived from a service from the Collaborative Design System.

In view at least thereof, neither Burke et al. nor Goodwin et al. nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest **the providing the collaboration services comprises enabling at least one generic collaboration service; wherein the modeling comprises: deriving at least one object specific service from the at least one generic collaboration service; and providing an object modeling layer that comprises a business object modeler to provide the UI for constructing a business object; and wherein the enabling services comprises: providing a service layer that is to enable the services and is separate from the object modeling layer**, as recited in claim 9. (emphasis added).

For at least the reasons above, neither Burke et al. nor Goodwin et al. nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest a computer-implemented method of implementing a composite application in a framework, the method comprising: accessing, by a computer, an object to exchange data with enterprise base systems and to present the data to a composite application through a uniform interface; modeling, by a computer, a business object to enable a user interface (UI) for constructing a business object; enabling, by a computer, services to the composite application including providing collaboration services to the composite application, the modeling comprises directly linking at least one of the collaboration services associated with the business object to the business object; wherein **the providing the collaboration services comprises enabling at least one generic collaboration service; wherein the modeling comprises: deriving at least one object specific service from the at least one generic collaboration service; and providing an object modeling layer that comprises a business object modeler to provide the UI for constructing a business object; and wherein the enabling services comprises: providing a service layer that is to enable the**

services and is separate from the object modeling layer, as recited in claim 9. (emphasis added).

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Added claim 17

Added claim 17 recites a computer program product comprising a machine readable storage device having instructions executable by a computer to cause the computer to perform a method comprising: accessing an object to exchange data with enterprise base systems and to present the data to a composite application through a uniform interface; modeling a business object to enable a user interface (UI) for constructing a business object; enabling services to the composite application including providing collaboration services to the composite application, the modeling comprises directly linking at least one of the collaboration services associated with the business object to the business object; wherein **the providing the collaboration services comprises enabling at least one generic collaboration service; wherein the modeling comprises: deriving at least one object specific service from the at least one generic collaboration service; and providing an object modeling layer that comprises a business object modeler to provide the UI for constructing a business object; and wherein the enabling services comprises: providing a service layer that is to enable the services and is separate from the object modeling layer**. (emphasis added).

Neither Burke et al. nor Goodwin et al. nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest the computer program product of claim 17.

Notably, and at the very least, neither Burke et al. nor Goodwin et al. nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest **the providing the collaboration services comprises enabling at least one generic collaboration service; wherein the modeling comprises: deriving at least one object specific service from the at least one generic collaboration service; and providing an object modeling layer that comprises a business object modeler to provide the UI for constructing a business object; and wherein the enabling services comprises: providing a service layer that is to enable the services and is separate from the object modeling layer**, as recited in claim 17. (emphasis added).

For at least the reasons above, neither Burke et al. nor Goodwin et al. nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest a computer program product comprising a machine readable storage device having instructions executable by a computer to cause the computer to perform a method comprising: accessing an object to exchange data with enterprise base systems and to present the data to a composite application through a uniform interface; modeling a business object to enable a user interface (UI) for constructing a business object; enabling services to the composite application including providing collaboration services to the composite application, the modeling comprises directly linking at least one of the collaboration services associated with the business object to the business object; wherein **the providing the collaboration services comprises enabling at least one generic collaboration service; wherein the modeling comprises: deriving at least one object specific service from the at least one generic collaboration service; and providing an object modeling layer that comprises a business object modeler to provide the UI for constructing a business object; and wherein the enabling services comprises: providing a service layer that is to enable the services and is separate from the object modeling layer**, as recited in claim 17. (emphasis added).

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Dependent claims

Claims 5-8 depend from independent claim 1 and therefore should be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1.

Claims 12-18 depend from independent claim 9 and therefore should be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 9.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Because the reasons set forth above are sufficient to overcome the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action, Applicants do not address some of the assertions set forth therein and/or other possible reasons for overcoming the rejections. Nonetheless, Applicants reserve the right to address such assertions and/or to present other possible reasons for overcoming the rejections in any future paper and/or proceeding.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application in any way, the Examiner is cordially requested to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-0006, ext. 1014.

Respectfully submitted,

November 19, 2010
Date

/Mark Steinberg/
Mark Steinberg
Registration No. 40,829
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-0006, ext. 1014